

## **\*Is the Authenticating & Weakening of the Hadīths by Shaykh al-Muhaddīth al-Albānī(رحمه الله) accurate or not?\***

**Shaykh al-Muhaddīth Sulaymān ibn Nāsir al-‘Alwān(حفظه الله) responds by saying:**

The brother says that a group of people say that the authenticating of al-Albānī(رحمه الله) isn't accurate in comparison to the early scholars. And this is True, whether he authenticated the Hadīths or weakened the Hadīths, because the Usūl that he follows in his authenticating and weakening is upon the Usūl of the Later scholars, upon the Usūl of ibn al-Salāh(رحمه الله), upon the Usūl of al-Hāfidh al-‘Irāqī(رحمه الله), upon the Usūl of ibn Hajr(رحمه الله), he doesn't follow in his Usūl, the Usūl of Yahyā ibn Sa'īd al Qattān(رحمه الله), the Usūl of ibn Mahdī(رحمه الله), the Usūl of Imām Ahmād(رحمه الله), the Usūl of al-Bukhārī(رحمه الله), Usūl of Muslim(رحمه الله), or upon the Usūl of the early scholars, so he goes along the Usūl of the later scholars, not the Usūl of the Early scholars, and if those were the means that he goes along, it is considered a weak means, so usually the end result would be inconsiderable. So consequently, he has many things that he authenticates which goes against the Methodology of the early scholars, or he weakens that which has a clear difference to the Methodology of the early scholars, because the differences between the early & the later scholars are many, I'll mention the most important of those differences to clarify the intent and meaning.

**So from among that**, al-Tadlees[covering up a break in the chain], whenever al-Tadlees is proven in the Hadīth, then it's a 'ila(hidden defect), and there's no dispute in this, whereas the later scholars consider the "an 'ana"[i.e. narrates by using the term "an"(from)] of the person described with Tadleeas as "Tadlees", and this hasn't been stated by any of the early scholars, and al-Albānī(رحمه الله) follows this principle, of the Usūl of the later scholars, not the Usūl of the early scholars. So he says about the hadith that it has 'an 'ana of al-Hassan(رحمه الله), it has 'an 'ana of Qatādah(رحمه الله), there is 'an 'ana of Abī Ishāq al-Sabī'ī(رحمه الله), there is 'an 'ana of al-A'mash(رحمه الله), there is 'an 'ana of ibn Jurayj(رحمه الله), there is 'an 'ana of ibn al-Zubayr(رحمه الله) and he defects the Hadīths in this way, he has weakened Hadīths in Muslim upon this way, and none of the early scholars were upon this Manhaj, and it's not known from any of the Imāms that they defected a Hadīth by 'an 'ana of a Mudallis or the person described with Tadleeas, rather the early scholars say "Dalas", and they do not say "an 'an", so if it's proven that he "Dalas"[cheated], we will defect the Hadīth because this is a disconnection, and if he 'an 'an and he didn't "Dalis", merely a 'an 'ana, this doesn't affect[the Hadīth], and this is what the early scholars are upon, and this is from the enormous differences between the early and the later scholars.

**The second matter:** Ziyādat ul-Thiqah[The addition of a trustworthy narrator]. The Madhab of the Fuqahā' and Mutakalimeen is that the addition of a trustworthy narrator is accepted in all cases, and many of the later scholars have followed this, so ibn Hajr(رحمه الله) says in al-Nukhbā "and the addition of its narrator is accepted, as long as it doesn't go against that whom is more authentic" and this is not the Manhaj of the [early] Imāms, and he has determined/stipulated the Manhaj of the Early scholars in "Kitāb al-Nukat 'ala kitab ibn al-Salāh", and in that book, he has overlooked/neglected in determining the Usūl of the early Imams in this matter, so some of the later scholars or a group of later scholars as it's the statement of the Fuqahā' that the addition of a trustworthy narrator is accepted and this is well-known in the authenticating of the later scholars, "This is an addition of a trustworthy narrator, therefore it's accepted". The early scholars do not give the addition an absolute/general ruling, so at times they would accept the addition and sometimes they would reject the addition, and they do not give an absolute/general ruling.

**The third matter:** Raising weak Hadīths to Hassan by Shawāhid(finding supporting narrations), the early scholars do not expand in that, and among the later scholars, there is severe expansion, that most of their authentications & Hassan gradings is when the Hadīth comes from different chains. And that is why the authentications by the later scholars have exceeded 50,000 Hadīths, and this is an exaggeration in the authenticating of Hadīths, and many of that is Munkar, it has no basis to it, the issue is not a Hadīth or 2 Hadīths, when the Hadīths reach 5,000 hadiths, 4000 are all Munkar[Denounced]. The early scholars did not call a Hadīth “Hassan” by Shawāhid except by well known conditions and guidelines as a methodology among them, so from that, they don’t call a Hadīth Hassan by Shawāhid in the Usūl[can’t be the main hadīth which Fiqh and rulings are derived from the hadīth] and they do not accept it. And from that, is that they don’t call a Hadīth Hassan by Shawāhid if it goes against an authentic Hadīth. And from that, is that they don’t call a Hadīth Hassan by Shawāhid if there’s a liar or a person accused of fabricating or a fault or a Nakārah(discrepancy) in the Isnād(chain).

**The fourth matter:** Al-Tafarrūd(singular narrations), the early scholars would consider the issue of Tafarrūd a great concern, and they would sometimes not accept the Hadīth of the Mutaffarid even if he was Trustworthy(Thiqah), and usually as a methodology that they had, they would reject the Hadīth of the Sadūq in the Usūl, and this isn’t taken into consideration by the later scholars, and they do not differentiate between what is in the Usūl[the main hadīth which Fiqh and rulings are derived from the hadīth & chapter] and what is in other than the Usūl, and by the end result of the inability to apply this methodology, they authenticate many Munkar Hadīths. Because the Hadīth of the Sadūq or the Hadith of a Thiqāh who doesn’t narrate a lot of Hadīths, and isn’t known by many singular narrations, if he makes Tafarrūd in an Asl, then this is a place of dispute, so from that, the hadith that was narrated by Ahmad(رحمه الله) and Abū Dāwūd(رحمه الله) in his Sunan from the chain of Muhammad ibn ishāq from Abī ‘Ubaydah ibn ‘Abdillāh ibn Zam’ah from his father from his mother from Umm Salamah that the Prophet(صلى الله عليه وسلم) said:

“On this day you have been allowed to take off ihram when you have thrown the stones at the jamrahs, that is, everything prohibited during the state of ihram is lawful except intercourse with a woman. If the evening comes before you go round this House (the Ka’bah) you will remain in the sacred state (i.e. ihram), just like the state in which you were before you threw stones at the jamrahs”

And this report is Munkar, it’s not possible to accept the Tafarrūd of ibn ishāq in it, and even if the Tafarrūd of ibn Ishāq was accepted, it’s not possible to accept the Tafarrūd of Abī ‘Ubaydah, and this is a followed principle among the early scholars, that in such a situation, the Tafarrūd of the Sadūq is not accepted who is not known with precision/accuracy and itqān(firmness/minimal errors) and a person who narrates many Ahādīth, and this is merely an example, for the examples are many. The later scholars do not look except at what seems to be apparent of the chain and what ibn Hajar(رحمه الله) said in al-Taqrīb “Thiqah” or “Sadūq” and in the end he says “its chain is authentic”.

**And this is the fifth matter;** that the later scholars go by the apparent look of the chains, they authentic based upon this, as for the early scholars, then no. They look at the chain and look at the matn(text), and when they look into the Isnād(chain), they look at several aspects:

**The first aspect:** The trustworthiness of the narrators.

**The second aspect:** Al-Sama’āt[Whether the narrators have met], they stress on the Sama’āt a lot.

**The third aspect:** Al-Tafarrûd[the narrator is alone in narrating a hadith], they stress on the chain and the Tafarrûd.

**The fourth aspect:** Al-Mukhālafah[The differences/oppositions between the narrators], they look at this very deeply.

**The fifth aspect:** al-Ikhtilāf[inconsistencies in who he's narrating from], they look into it very deeply, sometimes they would rule upon it with Idtirāb(shakiness).

The early scholars would consider this a very great concern; they wouldn't be heedless to any of these aspects.

**The sixth matter:** The Majhūl(unknown) Hadīth, the later scholars weaken the Hadith of Majhūl al-‘Ayn, or before that, they settled upon categorising Majhūl into two types, Majhūl Hāl[2 people have narrated from him] and Majhūl ‘Ayn[1 person has narrated from him]. So they weaken the Hadith of Majhūl al-‘Ayn and some of them weaken the Hadith of Majhūl al-Hāl, and some of them authenticate it, but as for the early scholars, then no. They mention conditions for a man whenever he would be considered Majhūl and whenever he wouldn't be considered Majhūl. So if he narrates from a narrator who's trustworthy many times, who is not known to narrate from the weak narrators, nor from the Unknown, then this would cause his Jahālah[unknownness] to be raised by the one who he narrated from. And they stipulate that his narrator must be consistent and not make Tafarrûd in an Asl[Main Hadith of the chapter/Original Version], and that he doesn't go against the trustworthy narrators, and this isn't taken into consideration among the later scholars. And it's narrated from the early scholars that if a narrator narrates from a group of trustworthy narrators, his Jahālah[unknownness] would be raised from him, and by this, they make the issue of Tafarrûd as an issue of Mukhālafah.

So these are the differences or some of differences between the Early & the Later scholars, and by applying these principles, your Usūl[Foundations] would become upright, and if the Foundation is upright, the branches would follow, and the end result would be stable/good, and by the deficiency of applying these principles, you will destabilise the Usūl, and if you've destabilised the Usūl, shakiness/destabilisation would be found in the branches, giving the poor end result.